

1

Remarks

2 This response is in reply to the Office Action dated October 14th, 2008. Currently, claims
3 1-19 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18.
4 Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-19.

5

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

6 The specification and claim 4 were objected to for lack of proper antecedent basis under
7 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

8 Claims 1, 4, 5, and 18 are objected to due to various informalities.

9 Claims 1 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing
10 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the
invention.

11 Claims 1-19 rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loveland (US
12 Patent No. 6,826,539 B2) in view of McClendon et al. (US Patent No. 6,625,619 B1)

13

II. Summary of the Amendments

14 Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended.

15 Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, and 19 stand as originally claimed.

**III. Improper antecedent basis under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) in regards to Claims 14-17, 20-26
and relevant Specification sections**

16 Examiner has rejected claim 4 and the relevant Specification sections in connection with
17 those claims due to lack of proper antecedent basis under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

18 Applicant has amended claims 4 in order to reflect the proper definitions of terms found
19 within the Specification.

20 Applicant submits that the amendments overcome the rejections and that the rejections be
21 withdrawn.

22

III. Informal Objections: Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, and 18

23 Examiner has objected to claims 1, 4, 5, 6, and 18 due to various informalities in claim
24 language and construction.

25 Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 5, 6, and 18 in order to correct the language
26 informalities.

27 Applicant submits that the amendments overcome the objections and that the objections
28 be withdrawn.

1 V. Rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph: Claim 1

2 Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 36 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite
3 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant
4 regards as the invention.

5 Applicant has amended claims 1 such as to overcome the rejection.

6 Applicant submits that the amendments overcome the rejection and that the rejection be
7 withdrawn.
8

9 VI. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) over Loveland (US Patent No. 6,826,539 B2) in view of
10 McClelondon et al. (US Patent No. 6,625,619 B1); Claims 1-19

12 Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 USC §103(a) over Loveland (US Patent No.
13 6,826,539 B2) in view of McClelondon et al. (US Patent No. 6,625,619 B1).

14 Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 19
15 such as to overcome the rejection.

16 Claims 2 and 3, as dependent claims, are thus now patentable over cited art based on the
17 amendments made.

18 Applicant submits that the amendments overcome the rejection and that the rejection be
19 withdrawn.

20 The current set of claims as written take into account the definition of an "Intelligent
21 CAD object" which is defined in paragraph 75 of the Applicant's Specification:

22 *Intelligent CAD objects are defined to be CAD elements stored in the database 22 and
23 linked to one or more component specifications also stored within the database 22.*

24 It is by way of this CAD object that our method associates graphical (IE CAD) elements
25 with non-graphical information. The graphical interface, as a preferred embodiment stated within
26 the specification, serves to input non-graphical information in order to generate the objects.
27 Therefore, Applicant asks that Examiner re-consider the claims in light of the addition of the
28 term "intelligent CAD objects" as defined within the Specification.

28 Additionally, the claims as amended now sufficiently overcome the teachings of
McClelondon, in particular those of the "LinkManager / LinkMan" as depicted by columns 19

1 through 22 of the Detailed Description in *McClelond* because the ultimate end products differ
2 between the Link Manager function in *McClelond* and our claimed invention. *McClelond's*
3 Link Manager manages the communication between applications containing properly indexed
4 data in order to highlight discrepancies among them for later resolution by an end user. (Columns
5 19, 20 generally) *McClelond* teaches that "The link Manager does its job by having a complete
6 copy of the taxonomy as its base data". (Column 19, line 36). *McClelond* also teaches that "only
7 built elements, products and properties that are already in either the taxonomy or the project
8 databases are recognized." (Column 19, line 54). Based on the teachings in *McClelond*,
9 *McClelond* does not disclose the "generating of Intelligent CAD object[s]" as it is claimed in
10 Applicants claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 14, and 18 as currently amended. Thus the final end product, the
11 Intelligent CAD object, disclosed within Applicant's invention is novel and specific over prior
12 art as described in *McClelond* and therefore allowable subject matter for patentability.

13 Applicant's invention as claimed does not require any sort of taxonomy in order to
14 generate an intelligent object for storage within its database. Additionally, Applicant's
15 specification at no point teaches that the database contains any sort of taxonomy in order to store
16 said objects. Examiner request that the invention's "generating" step should produce specific
17 data that is novel and detailed is sufficiently overcome by the integration of the properly
18 disclosed "Intelligent CAD objects" into the language of the claims.

19 For the Reason discussed above, the combination of *Loveland* and *McClelond* fails to
20 teach or make obvious each limitation claimed within claims 1, 5, 6, 14, 18 as currently
21 amended. Because the combination of *Loveland* and *McClelond* fails to teach or suggest each
22 limitation of the claims, Applicant asserts that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the
23 cited art under 35 USC 103(a). Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 19, as dependent on claims
24 discussed above, should be patentable for at least these reasons in addition to the distinguishing
25 limitations they recite currently as amended.

26

27

28

Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of Claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 504489 for any matter in connection with response that may be required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 14, 2009

By: / Juan P. Rodriguez/
Juan P. Rodriguez
Reg. No. 58499

TRIRIGA INC.
6700 Via Austi Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Telephone: (702) 932-2409
Facsimile: (702) 932-2417